

UNIVERSITY^f
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES



Attenhouse Orrery

Bulgaria and the Powers.

*Being a Series of Letters on the Balkans
written from Sofia.*

BY

THE O'MAHONY.

TOGETHER WITH THE SERBO-BULGARIAN TREATY,
THE SECRET ANNEX, AND THE MAP
ATTACHED THERETO.

WITH A

FOREWORD

BY R. J. KELLY, K.C.
" (anal.) "

1915.

DUBLIN :

SEALY, BRYERS AND WALKER,
ABBAY STREET.

940.92 / Om 14

UNIVERSITY
OF
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

Eur. war 1914 - date - Bulgaria
 " " " " Slav nations
 " " " " Small states
 " " " " Balkan states
 Balkan states - Hist - " "
 Bulgaria " "

Beck

A.C.
 940.92
 Om 14

FOREWORD.

The Slav cause is now being fought for by the Allied Powers with all their resources and with a determined resolve once and for all time to completely settle it. Austria-Hungary forced on the solution of the problem, and Austria-Hungary will pay the chief cost of the settlement. Pan-Germanism, too, thought it saw in Serbia an opportunity for striking at Slav expanding freedom, and of further extending its own malign influence. Through its sinister diplomacy Germany precipitated the conflict in which seven-eighths of Europe are to-day engaged. Russia, the hereditary friend and trusted protector of Slavdom, has solemnly pledged itself to the Slav's release from alien bondage, whether under Turk, Teuton, or Magyar. All Europe, all America that is not pro-German, sympathise with that noble sentiment and resolve of liberation. In the front rank of the small Slav States, by reason of its recent exploits, its proven bravery, and its racial possibilities, stands Bulgaria. The O'Mahony, in the following pages, tells the bright story of the Balkan League and of their splendid efforts in crushing the Turk, and he also at greater length dwells upon the sad story of their dissension and the disastrous effects of their disagreement. This defence of Bulgaria is laudable and is creditable for one who has practically and philanthropically shown his interest in the Bulgar people, who has done and is doing so much for them, who admires their virtues, praises their tolerance, and has such high hopes of their future. I entirely endorse from my own research and limited experience, that praise as well merited and I, too, entertain high hopes of the future for that brave people if it now accepts its destiny. We all can well understand and appreciate O'Mahony's chivalrous desire to defend

the fame and character of Bulgaria from the aspersions and charges that were some time ago levelled against her. It is the work and province of History, however, to apportion that blame. Practical politics demand practical work. History has now to be made not written. At present far more urgent matters than a recent past call for Bulgaria's serious consideration. The Slavs are about to be liberated or subjected to further and greater oppression as the result of the present gigantic war determines. Russia, their Protector, is to-day fighting for the Slavs allied with England and France, who were always the friends of Liberty and Freedom in Europe. If their combined efforts to strike down and shatter the aggressive spirit of German Militarism that so perilously threaten the peace and independence of every small State in Europe and purpose to strangle and crush every vestige of Nationality in them succeed, every Slav State, and Bulgaria with them, must benefit territorially and *otherwise*. If the attempt, however, of the Allies should happen unfortunately to fail or not be as effective and complete as it should be every Slav State, and Bulgaria especially, will materially and appreciably suffer. The time-old enemy of the Slavs—the wily Turk—has joined the Pan-Germanic League as his natural and congenial allies—and if these malign powers should unhappily prove victorious the Turk will be re-established in Europe and allowed to regain the territory he held in bondage and worried for centuries with periodic massacres. Bulgaria undoubtedly has reason to feel sore with its former allies in the first Balkan War. It may naturally wish to see them suffer, but in the present world-wide conflict Serbian subjection will mean the subjection of Bulgaria itself and of all Slavdom. The entire Slav race, not a separate section, is now fighting for its very existence. It is engaged on no local war but on a life and death struggle. It has entered on a grand and glorious crusade of universal emancipation and liberation. If the Allies succeed not an inch of

Slav land will remain under alien rule. If the Allies fail the Slav will be held under greater servitude and more grinding tyranny than ever. Will Bulgaria stand by and see the dreams of its race for liberation, for which it did so much in the recent past, now put in jeopardy? Will it not try and, as it already satisfactorily settled all common differences with Serb and Greek, before it entered on the glorious war of 1912, *at once* speedily set about a common arrangement that will form the basis of its immediate action. The points at issue, as originally determined and settled by the Treaty of London, are relatively few, and it ought not to be beyond the resources of its Diplomacy to adjust them. The hour of Slav Liberation has struck. It is the duty and interest of *every* Slav power to enter the war lists and to support with all the resources in its power the holy cause of their race and people. *Now or never.* Bulgaria cannot with impunity or honour stand aside while such a tremendous issue is at stake. The story of its recent wrongs History may be trusted to tell faithfully, and these wrongs are alone a matter for History. O'Mahony, in the pages of this record, has shown what Bulgaria is and what it has gone through and what has been its unhappy lot, but events are moving rapidly since the Treaty of Bucharest, and a new situation, never then contemplated, has arisen to-day in Europe. Never were the Fates so favourable for Slavdom if the Slavs be only true to themselves and if they sink all differences and combine for the common cause of their common liberation, for which holy purpose the Allies are fighting with such magnificent courage in Poland, France, and Flanders. In the interest of the Slav cause, in the interest of endangered human liberty, in the interest of peace and humanity itself Bulgaria and every other Slav State should at once enter the lists and so swell by its Army the volume of opposition to Pan-Germanism and Militarism which threaten to crush the liberties of Europe and the independence of every small State in it.

I am sure the effect of the ventilation of O'Mahony's powerful appeal for Bulgaria will be the just consideration of its claims by the Diplomats of Europe when the time comes, but Bulgaria *must now bestir* itself and move at once if it wants justice. The time for action has come. Bulgaria surely cannot stand aside in the glory-covered war of Slav liberation now proceeding and, sulking in its tent, see the cause of its race in peril for want of its services or triumph without its co-operation.

Every lover of Liberty must ardently wish and pray for the success of the Allied Powers—for in that success are the triumph of Slavdom and of the principle of Nationality and the continued existence of the small States of Europe—their salvation from absorption in threatened Pan-Germanism and Militarism. The greater the opposition to these formidable forces, the more universal the resistance arrayed against the aggressions of Pan-Germanism, the more complete and universal will be their defeat and the greater and more enduring the triumph of the imperilled Causes of Liberty and Independence.

R. J. KELLY.

45 Wellington Road,
Dublin.

February, 1915.

An Open Plea for a Small Nation.

*From THE O'MAHONY to The
Right Hon. L. HARCOURT.*

ST. PATRICK'S ORPHANAGE,
23, RUE GLADSTONE,
SOFIA,
BULGARIA,

October 26th, 1914.

MY DEAR HARCOURT,

No one will I think be bold enough to assert that the present state of affairs in the Balkan Peninsula is either satisfactory or permanent. The history of Modern Europe teaches us that even Mighty Empires cannot trample on the national feelings of the smaller races with impunity. What but the deep and unquenchable desire to win the union and the freedom of her race could have nerved Bulgaria to hurl back the Turkish legions and to win those glorious victories which though almost fruitless have won for her undying honour.

In this present gigantic war the regard for national feeling has shown itself to be an exceeding great strength, the disregard of it an unending weakness.

What but the spirit of nationality could have braced Belgium to her splendid resistance to German aggression? What but the undying desire to regain her lost territories and people could have enabled France to fight as she is now fighting?

What but the concession of self government to Ireland could have brought her so unreservedly to the side of Great Britain? What but the recognition of nationalities within the Empire and the freedom of its various states, could have produced the enthusiastic devotion with which every portion of our Empire has rallied to the flag? As freedom has grown within its borders so has the power and security of the Empire increased, until in this war we see a mighty union of free peoples of many races and of many beliefs, vying with one another to show the strength and force which freedom gives.

No proclamation promising future liberty, religious or political, has been needed to win the support of any race within the British Empire. Has Russia really gained by taking Bessarabia from Roumania in 1878? Has Roumania gained strength by taking so unjustly from Bulgaria the richest portion of her territory the Dobrudja, in the moment of her isolation and her weakness? Has Greece gained strength by seizing portions of Macedonia, rightly Bulgarian, although she has almost exterminated by massacre the Bulgarians who did not fly?—territory conceded to Bulgaria by the Treaty of San Stefano and absolutely necessary to Bulgaria for her economic development. Is Servia stronger now in the hour of her trial, because she broke the Treaty solemnly made before the war with Turkey, and seized territory inhabited by Bulgarians and acknowledged by solemn treaty to be rightly Bulgarian? Has Europe gained by allowing Turkey to take advan-

tage of the unprovoked invasion of Bulgaria by Roumania to break the Treaty signed in London only a few months before under the auspices of Sir Edward Grey? Is not the present state of Europe chiefly due to the disregard of treaties, especially during the last few years, and to the utter unconcern shown towards the feelings of the people of the territories dealt with?

Where was the sense of justice when Europe allowed, without a protest, Bulgaria to be deprived of nearly all the fruits of victory in spite of the magnificent services she had rendered to the cause of liberty, in spite of her awful sacrifices of blood and treasure? The sense of justice was clouded by the ambitions of Great Powers, and by the campaign of lies so unscrupulously conducted during the time of her isolation, when she was cut off from all communication with the west of Europe. The war which commenced as a war of liberation became a war of subjugation owing to the intervention of Roumania, who had taken no part whatever in the work of liberation. The larger portion of the Bulgarian race, put back under the Turkish yoke by the Treaty of Berlin, for whose freedom Bulgaria worked so incessantly, and fought so nobly, is now subject to yokes more galling, more hated, and more oppressive than that of the Turk, and in addition a portion of her race freed from the Turkish yoke in 1878 has been placed after 36 years of freedom under the unsympathetic and oppressive yoke of Roumania.

The deadly misrepresentations which so clouded the judgment of Europe in 1913 have been fully and impartially dealt with by the Carnegie Commission. Sooner or later, if there is to be a lasting peace in the Balkans, the injustice of the Treaty of Bucharest will have to be remedied. The sooner the better. Already Roumania is playing the same game that served her

during the Balkan War, and again Greece and Servia are carrying on the campaign of misrepresentation that so clouded the judgment of Europe in 1913. With the earnest desire to secure fair treatment for a people amongst whom I have worked for the best part of ten years, a people amongst whom I have lived, and learnt not only to admire but to love, I venture to put before you some facts which I trust will enable you to realize how much Bulgaria did for her race in Turkish territory, since the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, that is in the forty years preceding the War of 1912-13.

Before the establishment of the Exarchate the Greek Church was the only Orthodox Church acknowledged by Turkey. As in Turkey all education is carried on by the Churches, the education of the Bulgarians was in the hands of the Greeks. The Turkish Government regarded the Bulgarians as Greeks, and the Greeks encouraged this fable, so conveniently in accordance with their dreams. When after a long struggle the Bulgarian Exarchate was revived and acknowledged by the Turks, the Greek Patriarch declared the Bulgarian Church to be schismatic, and excommunicated it. This will enable you to appreciate better the bitterness of the position of Bulgarians in Greek and Servian Macedonia, where all their Churches and Schools have been seized, where they are now not allowed to be educated in their own language, and are only allowed the ministrations of Priests of a Church that regards them as schismatics. The work carried out by Bulgaria for the members of her race outside the borders assigned to her by the Treaty of Berlin will show how intimately she was bound up with the life of the people in that greater portion of Macedonia, now so cruelly separated from her, and will help to explain the presence in Bulgaria at the present time of over 160,000 refugees who have fled from their "liberators"!

Number of Bulgarian Exarchate Churches, Chapels, Metropolitan Bishops, Priests, Schools, Teachers and Scholars in Macedonia and Thrace in year 1911. Showing the number in Territory accorded to Greece and Servia respectively by the Treaty of Bucharest.

	In territory now Servian.	In territory now Greek.	In the remainder of Thrace and Macedonia.	Total in Macedonia and Thrace.
Metropolitan Bishops ..	5	—	2	7
Priests	647	299	364	1,310
Churches	677	300	354	1,331
Chapels	54	78	162	294
Monasteries	48	11	14	73
Schools (Gymnasium, High Schools) ..	5	4	4	13
(Progymnasium, Secondary Schools)	35	23	29	87
Primary Schools ..	556	313	404	1,273
Total number of Schools	596	340	437	1,373
Teachers in High Schools	52	56	40	148
Ditto in Secondary Schools	106	53	79	238
Ditto in Primary Schools	847	480	553	1,880
Total number of Teachers	1,005	589	672	2,266
Scholars attending—				
High Schools ..	875	825	491	2,191
Secondary Schools ..	1,955	931	1,423	4,309
Primary Schools ..	33,156	17,210	21,988	72,354
Total number of Scholars	35,986	18,966	23,902	78,854

Speaking recently in Dublin, alluding to one of the main objects for which the present war is being waged, Mr. Asquith said: "It means that room must be found and kept for the independent existence and the free development of the smaller nationalities, each with a corporate consciousness of its own." The above list of Churches, Priests, Schools and Scholars in the territory

liberated by the Allies is the measure of the Corporate Consciousness of the Bulgarian race in those territories, and the enslavement of that corporate consciousness in the portions of that territory given to Greece and Servia respectively by the treaty of Bucharest. To judge the value of this list it must be, however, borne in mind that as Bulgaria increased in power after her liberation, Turkey took every means to stop her progress in Macedonia, and closed many of her Schools and Churches, a persecution which culminated in the massacres of 1903, directed solely against Bulgarians, and aided, alas! in many instances by the Greeks. But in addition Turkey has regained a large portion of the territory left to Bulgaria by the treaty of Bucharest, a portion that was served by 83 Priests, 81 Churches, 184 Teachers, 99 Schools with an attendance of 5,597 Scholars. From that portion all Bulgarians except a few in Adrianople and Kirk Kilisse fled when the Turks reconquered it, and they have not been allowed by the Turks to return. Thus, of the territory freed by the treaty of London in which the Corporate Consciousness of the Bulgarian race was shown by 1,310 Priests, 1,331 Churches, 294 Chapels, 1,373 Schools, 2,266 Teachers and 78,854 Scholars, Bulgaria has been despoiled of territory in which the Corporate Consciousness of her race was represented by 1,029 Priests, 1,058 Churches, 147 Chapels, 67 Monasteries, 1,035 Schools, 1,778 Teachers and 60,549 Scholars.

In Turkey there is practically no Bulgarian race left. In Greece and Servia the Churches and Schools have been seized, the people are no longer ministered to by their own Priests, and the young are not allowed to be taught in their own language.

In addition to all this, when after the war of liberation Bulgaria's treacherous allies turned against her, Roumania, who had taken no part whatever in that war,

seized the richest portion of Bulgarian territory, the Dobrudja. This territory, Bulgarian since her liberation in 1878, contains portions of two Bulgarian Dioceses, 67 Churches, and was ministered to by 53 Priests. The Priests have been compelled to hold services alternately in Slavonic and Roumanian, though neither they nor their congregations understand Roumanian. Those who have refused to do this have been expelled. The Priests have been placed under the jurisdiction of a Roumanian Bishop, and Bulgarian Priests are being continually replaced by Roumanians.

At the time of the seizure of the Dobrudja there were two High Schools with 17 Teachers, 11 Secondary Schools with 79 Teachers, and 175 Communal Primary Schools with 320 Teachers. All the School Buildings have been seized and the teachers dismissed, with the exception of one Communal School in each of the following towns: Silistra, Baltchik, Tontrakan, Dobritch, and Kavarna. This is the freedom accorded to the Bulgarian nationality in that portion of Bulgaria seized by Roumania. If the result of the present war is to be the realization of Mr. Asquith's views as expressed in Dublin, the Treaty of Bucharest will require a very complete revision. Nothing short of this will enable Bulgaria to obtain room for the independent existence and free development of its Nationality.

Yours very sincerely,

O'MAHONY.

LETTERS ON THE BALKANS IN 1914.

FIRST LETTER.

THE BULGARIAN AND SERBIAN TREATY BEFORE THE
WAR OF 1912.

November 2nd, 1914.

Great Britain declared war on Germany because of a broken treaty, and by so doing has gained eternal honour. In 1913 Bulgaria was forced into a war with Serbia because of a broken treaty. Are the treaties of Great Powers more sacred than the treaties between small nations? Since the Treaty of Berlin, that crowning iniquity of modern European statesmanship, the freedom of small nationalities has been treated as of little importance, and the promises made to them of no account. Military power and the greed of territory have brooded over the councils of Europe. When Germany annexed Alsace and Lorraine, a future war between France and Germany became a certainty. If the Treaty of San Stefano had not been interfered with, a large Bulgaria would have proved the value of what Mr. Gladstone called "the free breasts of a free people" as a bulwark against the aggression even of more powerful neighbours. When the Treaty of Berlin put back the Christian population of Macedonia, almost entirely Bulgarian, under the Turkish yoke, and divided the remnant of the Bulgarian race into two small States, it once more placed the Balkans at the mercy and intrigues of its two powerful neighbours, and rendered war between Austria and Russia merely a matter of time and opportunity. Great Britain, who took the leading part in that Treaty, incurred a heavy responsibility in the separation

of the Bulgarian race, a responsibility which rests to this day more heavily on her than on any other Power in Europe. The war in the Balkan States against Turkey commenced as a war of liberation ; it ended as a war of subjugation. Before that war commenced a definite treaty was made and signed between Serbia and Bulgaria. That treaty divided Macedonia into two portions. The larger southern and eastern portion was acknowledged to be rightly Bulgarian, an undisputed zone. The smaller north-western portion, a disputed zone, was left to be settled after the war, with the proviso that if Serbia and Bulgaria could not come to an amicable settlement, it was to be submitted to the arbitration of the Tsar of Russia. Before the second war commenced Serbia had shown her determination not to abide by this treaty, by closing Bulgarian schools, by arresting Bulgarians, by expelling Bulgarian priests and bishops. When the Russian Minister at Belgrade, the late Monsieur Hartwig, before the second war, was asked to use his influence to bring together Serbia and Bulgaria, in the interest of the Balkan States, he blurted out : " I care nothing for the Balkan States ; I am working for my country. Serbia must be strong. Bulgaria has been coquetting with Austria, and cannot be trusted. Bulgaria must give way all along the line." Such were the lines on which Russian diplomacy was conducted during the second war. Roumania was permitted to invade Bulgaria without a particle of justification, and to seize from her the richest portion of her territory, the Dobrudja, not only in defiance of her national rights, but in flagrant defiance of a solemn agreement entered into at Petrograd, in which all the Ambassadors took part, the ink of which was scarcely dry. The Treaty of Bucharest was wrung from Bulgaria bleeding, deserted, betrayed, and was called a peace. A peace founded on two broken treaties. The Concert of Europe, founded, I presume, on the Treaty of Berlin, has of recent years been chiefly occupied in breaking it. Its labours have ever been

marked by the defeat of all straightforward diplomacy by the opposing intrigues and the rival ambitions of Powers armed to the teeth. Its last futile breath was used before the Balkan War in the declaration that no matter what the issue of the war might be, neither side would be allowed to reap the fruits of victory in any territorial gain.

The Concert filled the waste paper basket of Europe with the fragments of broken treaties—the Treaty of Berlin torn up by Austria, by Italy, by Roumania, and by the Balkan States; the treaty made between Serbia and Bulgaria before the war with Turkey; the solemn agreement made between Roumania and Bulgaria at Petrograd. Little wonder that the Treaty of London followed the others into the waste-paper basket, torn in twain! Little wonder that Turkey regarded the strongly worded protests of the Powers with the contempt which they deserved! But, in all seriousness, I ask: Has the world ever seen a more humiliating spectacle?

Wordy, empty protests from the Powers called Great. The bravest, most liberty-loving, most progressive, most tolerant race in the Balkan Peninsula attacked by her treacherous allies, aided by a quondam friend. Deserted by the great Slav Power, compelled to demobilise, and thus left defenceless, friendless, with her wounds still gaping, to treat as best she could with her old enemy, Turkey, to secure for herself some few fragments of the Treaty of London, so insolently torn up and flung in the face of Europe. The Powers of Europe stood by and watched. To reap man sows. That which he sows he reaps. The Concert of Europe has sown, now it reaps.—Yours, etc.,

O'MAHONY.

St. Patrick's Orphanage,
23, Rue Gladstone,
Sophia, Bulgaria,

SECOND LETTER.

THE CARNEGIE COMMISSION'S REPORT.—BULGARIA'S WISH FOR ARBITRATION WITH SERBIA.— THE TREATY OF BUCHAREST.

In a former letter I alluded to the treaty between Serbia and Bulgaria made before the war of 1912. That treaty divided Macedonia into an undisputed zone, acknowledged to be Bulgarian, and a disputed zone, to which both Serbia and Bulgaria had pretensions, which, failing agreement, were to be submitted to the arbitration of the Tsar of Russia. As regards this treaty the Carnegie Commission reports :

“The fundamental point was the delimitation of the line of partition beyond which Serbia agreed to formulate no territorial claim. A highly detailed map of this frontier was annexed to the treaty.” (See Appendix.)

It is quite plain from the report of the Carnegie Commission that from the commencement of the war against Turkey, Serbia never intended to be bound by this solemn treaty. Bulgaria was forced to send the bulk of her army against the main Turkish army in Thrace, the freeing of Macedonia had to be left to Serbia and Greece.

Bulgarian revolutionary bodies had been struggling for years against Turkish misrule, never aided, but often opposed, by Greeks and Serbians because they were Bulgarians. At first these revolutionary bands marched with the Greeks and Serbians against the Turks, but as

the Turks were driven back, both Greeks and Serbians got rid of these bodies under pretence of establishing order. The schools being, as the Carnegie Commission says, "centres from which Bulgarian civilisation emanated," were next dealt with. The Carnegie Commission, describing the action of the Greek and Serbian armies, says :

"Their first act on arriving in any place whatsoever was to close the schools and use them as quarters for the soldiers. Then the teachers of the village were collected together and told that their services were no longer required, if they refused to teach in Greek or Serbian. Those who continued to declare themselves Bulgarians were exposed to a persecution whose severity varied with the length of their resistance. Even the most intransigent had to avow themselves beaten in the end ; if not they were sometimes allowed to depart for Bulgaria, but more usually sent to prison in Salonica or Uskub."

Next the Priests and Bishops were attacked. In the words of the Carnegie Commission :

"The most difficult people to subdue were the Priests. They were first asked to change the language of divine service. Endeavours were made to subject them to Serbian or Greek ecclesiastical authorities, and they were compelled to mention their names in the liturgy. If the Priest showed the smallest inclination to resist his exarchiate church was taken from him and handed over to the patriarchists ; he was forbidden to hold any communication with his flock, and on the smallest disobedience was accused of political propaganda and treason."

The persecution of the Bishops followed. Neophyte, Bishop of Keles, and Cosmas, Bishop of Debra, were

expelled. Again, in the words of the Carnegie Commission :

“ It was even worse at Uskub, where the holder of the Bishopric, the Archmandrite Methodius, was first driven out of his house, taken by force, shut up in a room, and belaboured by four soldiers until he lost consciousness, April 8/21. Cast out into the street, Methodius escaped into a neighbouring house, in which a Frenchman dwelt who told the story to Mr. Cartier, French Consul at Uskub. Under his protection, Methodius left for Salonica on April 13/26, whence he was sent to Sophia. The Commission has in its possession a deposition signed by the foreign doctors of Salonica who saw and examined Methodius on April 15/18 and found his story ‘entirely probable.’ ”

These things were done whilst the war against Turkey was still in progress.

Bulgaria has often been accused of unwillingness to submit her case to the arbitration of the Tsar of Russia. She was always willing to submit to arbitration the disputed zone, alone marked out for arbitration by the treaty itself. Serbia was only willing to submit to arbitration the revision of the whole treaty. Safely might she do so. Quite recently a Serbian statesman, Monsieur P. Marinkovitch, in conversation with a Bulgarian Deputy, Monsieur Adam Neitchoff, on being asked what would have happened if the Tsar of Russia had arbitrated, said, “ We would not have relinquished Macedonia ; you, however, would not have lost Shtip, Kotezana, Seres, Cavala, Koukoush, etc. As to the arbitration of the Russian Emperor, we had received in the first half of the month of May positive assurance that we would keep the country as far as the Vardar. A question might have been raised only as regards Bitola (Monastir), but in no case as regards Ochrida. You are

mistaken if you think we insisted to remain in Macedonia because we failed to obtain an outlet on the Adriatic. This has nothing in common with Macedonia." Yet Monsieur Marinkovitch came to Sofia professedly on a mission of peace.

I have shown conclusively that long before the second war commenced Serbia had broken the solemn treaty made with Bulgaria before the war with Turkey, in spirit and in essence. If Great Britain was justified in declaring war on Germany because of the breach of the treaty maintaining the neutrality of Belgium, Bulgaria was still more justified in going to war with Serbia for the breach of a treaty in consideration of which 1,228 Bulgarian officers and 82,261 soldiers had already fallen in the war against the Turks. The Serbian losses in the same war amounted to 23,000 ; no distinction is, however, made between officers and men. The Greek losses during the war against Turkey were not given to the Carnegie Commission. That Russia should have allowed the grossly unfair treatment meted out not only to Bulgaria, but to the Bulgarian race in Macedonia, by the Treaty of Bucharest, founded on two broken treaties, can only be explained by her then policy described by her Minister at Belgrade, Monsieur Hartwegg, as follows : "Serbia must be strong." Her subsequent action in allowing the Treaty of London to be broken by the Turks can only be explained by supposing the addition to her then policy of "Bulgaria must be weak." The reason that Austria did not protest effectively against the Treaty of Bucharest is easy to understand. She did not wish to offend Roumania, and she knew that Russia's action would be deeply resented in Bulgaria, that Serbia would in reality be weaker by her temporary acquisition of Macedonia, and weaker by the bitter hostility of the Bulgarian race.

Why Great Britain entered no protest against the flagrant injustice of the Treaty of Bucharest is not so

easy to understand. It must be remembered that the judgment of Western Europe was clouded at that time by the campaign of untruths so unscrupulously conducted, during the six weeks of Bulgaria's isolation, by Greece and Serbia in order to prejudice European opinion against Bulgaria and to cover their own misdeeds. The policy adopted by Great Britain appears to have been a continuation of that inaugurated, so unhappily, by Mr. Balfour, of leaving the whole Balkan question in the hands of the two Powers which he described as the most interested. It was also probably a last ineffectual effort to maintain what was called the Concert of Europe, a Concert that never had any effective existence, except so far as it provided a field for the exercise of unscrupulous diplomacy in furtherance of selfish ambitions and lust of power. The mills of God grind slowly, yet still they grind. The Powers of Europe in this gigantic war, this mass of human misery, woe, and sorrow, are paying a heavy price for their sins of omission and commission towards the Christian races of the Balkans, and for that Militarism which has treated tracts of lands as Empire and the inhabitants thereof as chattel.

O'MAHONY.

THIRD LETTER.

THE CARNEGIE REPORT ON THE STATE OF MACEDONIA.—

THE CONDUCT OF THE BULGARS DURING THE WAR.

The campaign of cruel misrepresentation carried on against Bulgaria during the period of her isolation was undoubtedly most injurious to Bulgaria. Fortunately the whole matter has been fully and impartially dealt with by the Carnegie Commission. That many cruel deeds were perpetrated during the war of liberation, *i.e.*, the war against Turkey, is an established fact. It was a war to liberate from the Turkish yoke a Christian population. A yoke which for five centuries had made the history of the Balkans a record of rebellion, repression, and massacre. The Carnegie Commission says :

“The defeat of the Turkish armies meant something more than a political change. It reversed the relations of conquerors and serfs : it promised a social revolution.”

As regards Macedonia it says :

“The regular army (Bulgarian) was not numerous, it marched rapidly southwards towards Salonica, leaving no sufficient garrison behind it. It is not surprising in these conditions that the Moslem population endured during the early weeks of the war a period of lawless vengeance and unmeasured suffering. In many districts the Moslem villages were systematically burned by their Christian neighbours. Nor was it only the region occupied by the Bulgarians which suffered. In the province of Monastir, occupied by

the Serbs and Greeks, the agents of the British Macedonian Relief Fund calculated that eighty per cent. of Moslem villages were burned. Salonica, Monastir, and Uskub were thronged with thousands of homeless and starving Moslem refugees, many of whom emigrated to Asia. The Moslem quarter of the town of Jeudje-Vardar was almost totally burned down in spite of the fact that this town was occupied by the main Greek army. Even in the immediate neighbourhood of Salonica Moslem villages were burned by the Greek troops. The Greek population of Drama district indulged in robbery, murder, and violation at the expense of the Moslem inhabitants, until order was restored by an energetic Bulgarian prefect."

The Commission alludes to a particularly brutal campaign of robbery and murder carried out at Stroumitza, of which it says "it was probably the worst incident of its kind."

"A commission was formed under Major Grbits and with him sat two junior Servian officers, the Bulgarian Sub-Prefect, Lieutenant Nicholas Voulchew, the leader of the Bulgarian bands, Bogovoda Jckekov, and some of the leading inhabitants."

Before this court the Moslems were summoned to appear.

"As each victim came before the judges Major Grbits inquired, 'Is he good or is he bad?' there was no discussion and no defence. One voice sufficed to condemn. Hardly one in ten of those who were summoned escaped the death sentence. The victims were roughly stripped of their outer clothing and bound in the presence of the commission, while the money found on them was taken by Major Grbits."

At a Bulgarian courtmartial subsequently held Voulchew, Jckekov, and another named Matov were sen-

tenced to fifteen years hard labour, but, according to the Commission :

“The Serbian Government, on the other hand, has inflicted no punishment on Major Grbits, who was the senior officer and the person ultimately responsible for these atrocities.”

Referring to the account of atrocities committed in the Kukush region by a notoriously cruel guerrilla chief, Donthew, the Commission says :

“It was misused and distorted in some Greek and French newspapers, as though it referred to the doings of the Bulgarian regular army shortly before the second war.”

A very strong order was issued from the headquarters of the Bulgarian Army on January 10th, 1913, directing immediate inquiry into all excesses, robberies, and violations; towards the end of the order are these words :

“The Bulgarian Army must prove to the eyes of the whole world that now, as always, justice and legality are supreme within its ranks and that criminals do not go unpunished.”

This order had been preceded early in the war by orders issued by General Savoff, dated October 14th, 1912, and December 13th, 1912. The latter concludes as follows :

“Let it not be forgotten we have undertaken the war in the name of an elevated human ideal, the liberation of this population from a régime made insupportable by its severity and injustice. May God help the valiant sons of Bulgaria to realise this noble ideal, may they assist in restraining one another from compromising the great and glorious work in the eyes of the civilised world and of their dear native land.”

Commenting on this order, the Carnegie Commission remarks :

“ It is with a sense of moral well-being that one pauses in the midst of the horrors which we have been compelled to describe to read these lines so different in their spirit from the august threats which speak in the well-known telegram of King Constantine.”

(King Constantine is the present King of Greece, brother-in-law of the German Emperor, and succeeded to the throne after the assassination of his father, King George, in the streets of Salonica by a Greek. It was to secure Kavala and Seres for him that the German Emperor “ fought like a lion ” at the time of the conference of Bucharest.)

“ The desire to remain just and noble is a merit which we desire to note. It is a tendency which we have only found amongst Bulgarian officers and intellectuals.”

It is now necessary to consider briefly the conduct of Bulgarians during the second war. Alluding to the charge of gross cruelty brought by the Greeks against the Bulgarians, the Commission remarks :

“ That some of these accusations were grossly exaggerated is now apparent. *Le Temps*, for example reported the murder of the Greek Bishop of Doiran. We saw him vigorous and apparently alive two months afterwards. A Requiem Mass was sung for the Bishop of Kavala; his flock welcomed him back to them while we were in Salonica. The correspondent of the same paper (*le Temps*) stated that he had personally assisted at the burial of the Archbishop of Seres, who was savagely mutilated before he was killed. This distressing experience in no way caused this prelate to interrupt his duties, which he still performs.”

Alluding to Greek accusations regarding Bulgarian action at Doxato, Seres, Demir-Hissar, the Commission says, "In no case do they state the whole truth."

At the commencement of the second war the Bulgarians in South-Eastern Macedonia were in occupation of a country whose population was mainly Greek and Turkish. The Bulgarian garrisons were small. Doxato the Commission describes as a compact Greek island in a rural population which was almost exclusively Turkish. The Commission expresses its conviction that the Greeks had organised a formidable military movement, that Doxato was one of its centres, that several hundreds of armed men were concentrated there, that provocation had been given by a wanton and barbarous slaughter of Moslem non-combatants by the Greeks, and also by a successful attack at Doxato upon a Bulgarian convoy. The Bulgarian troops attacked Doxato and defeated the Greek irregulars, and undoubtedly killed many. They were then compelled to withdraw, as they were threatened by Greek columns marching from several quarters. They allowed the local Moslems to arm themselves with arms taken from the Greeks. As soon as the Bulgarians withdrew the Moslems massacred the Greek population. The Commission says :

"We don't hesitate to conclude that the massacre at Doxato was a Turkish and not a Bulgarian atrocity."

The Bulgarian regular troops withdrew from Serres on July 5th. The Greek Archbishop assumed the command of the town and prepared to defend it with Greek irregulars and armed citizens. The Bulgarian population was hunted down, over two hundred were taken to the Bishop's Palace, and from there they were taken to a Greek school, where they were barbarously tortured, and then done to death in batches. Partly because they

had left large stores of munitions in the town and partly because rumours of the schoolhouse massacre had reached them the Bulgarians were anxious to return. On July 11th Commandant Kirpikoff marched against Serres, he defeated the Greek Militia outside the town. On entering the town the troops were met with a heavy fire from several large houses held by Greeks. Against these he finally used his guns. From this time onward the town was in flames at several points. During the afternoon the Greek main army approached and shelled the town, and the Bulgarians had once more to retreat. The Commission condemns both Bulgarians and Greeks for using artillery against an unfortified town. One has since learned that even in the civilised West of Europe such deeds are not uncommon during war between highly civilised nations. When the Bulgarian regular troops attacked Seres on July 11th there were still between 60 and 70 Bulgarian prisoners alive in the schoolhouse. Their gaolers proceeded to finish the butchery, but in their hurry their grim work was inefficiently done, and eight of their prisoners, badly wounded, but still alive, succeeded in escaping, and reached the Bulgarian troops. Three of these the Commission interviewed, all bearing fresh scars. In describing their wounds the Commission says :

“They were such wounds as a butcher would inflict who was attempting to slaughter men as he would slaughter sheep.”

Describing these prisoners the Commission says :

“The immense majority were, however, inoffensive tradesmen or peasants whose only offence was that they were Bulgarians. Among them were four women, who were killed with the rest.” “The victims were arrested and imprisoned under the authority of the (Greek) Archbishop.”

It is necessary to refer to the Greek accusations regarding Demir-Hissar because they were used by King Constantine as an excuse for his telegram ordering reprisals. In reference to this telegram the Commission points out that the Greek excesses began in and around Kukush some days before the event at Demir-Hissar. In the words of the Commission :

“The Bulgarian army beaten in the south was fleeing in some disorder through Demir-Hissar to the narrow defile of the Struma above this little town. The Greeks of the town, seeing their confusion, determined to profit by it, took up arms, and fell upon the Bulgarian wounded, the baggage trains, and the fugitive peasants. They rose too soon, and exposed themselves to Bulgarian reprisals. When the Greek Army at length marched in, it found a scene of carnage and horror. The Greek inhabitants had slaughtered defenceless Bulgarians and the Bulgarian rearguard had exacted vengeance.”

The Bulgarians state that about 250 Bulgarians were killed. The Greeks state that 71 Greeks were killed. The Bulgarians state that the Greek Bishop led the attack and that he fired the first shot. The Commission find “nothing improbable” in this statement. The Greeks admit he resisted arrest. He was undoubtedly killed. The Greeks reported the murder of four Greek Bishops. The Commission find that the Bishop of Demir-Hissar alone was killed. Regarding the general conduct of the Greek Army the Commission states :

“In one instance a number of Europeans witnessed the brutal conduct of a detachment of Greek regulars under three officers. Fifteen wounded Bulgarian soldiers took refuge in the Catholic Convent of Paliortsi near Gheogeli, and were nursed by the sisters. Father Alloati reported this fact to the Greek Commandant, whereupon a detachment was sent to

search the convent for a certain vogévoda (chief of Bands) named Arghyr, who was not there. In the course of the search a Bulgarian Catholic Priest, Father Trepitché, and the Armenian doctor of the convent were severely flogged in the presence of the Greek officers. A Greek soldier attempted to violate a Nun, and during the search a sum of L.T.300 (three hundred pounds Turkish) was stolen. Five Bulgarian women and a young girl were put to torture, and a large number of peasants carried off to prison for no good reason. The officer in command threatened to kill Father Alloati on the spot, and to burn down the convent. If such things could be done to Europeans in a building under the protection of the French flag, it is not difficult to believe that Bulgarian peasants fared incomparably worse."

On July 27th the Bulgarians captured the baggage of the nineteenth Greek infantry regiment at Dobrinichté. Amongst the baggage were a number of letters written by the Greek soldiers, most of which bore the regimental postal stamp. These letters the Commission carefully examined, and report:

"The Commission, in short, is satisfied that the letters are genuine."

"These few extracts, each from a separate letter, may suffice to convey their general tenor:

"1. By order of the King we are setting fire to all the Bulgarian villages because the Bulgarians burned the beautiful town of Seres, Nigrita and several Greek villages. We have shown ourselves far more cruel than the Bulgarians.'

"2. Here we are burning the villages and killing the Bulgarians, both women and children.'

"3. We took only a few (prisoners), and these we killed, for such are the orders we received.'

"4. We have to burn the villages—such is the

order—slaughter the young people and spare only the old people and children.’

“‘5. What is done to the Bulgarians is indescribable; also to the Bulgarian peasants. It was a butchery. There is not a Bulgarian town or village but is burned.’

“‘6. We massacre all the Bulgarians who fall into our hands, and burn the villages.’

“‘7. Of the 1,200 prisoners we took at Nigrita, only forty-one remain in the prisons, and everywhere we have been we have not left a single root of this race.’

“‘8. We picked out their eyes (five Bulgarian prisoners) while they were still alive.’

“‘9. The Greek Army sets fire to all villages where there are Bulgarians, and massacres all it meets. . . . God knows where this will end.’”

I add one extract from the Appendix :

“We have turned out much crueller than the Bulgars—we violated every girl we met.”

The Commission concludes its report on the action of the Greek regular army as follows :

“Systematically, and in cold blood, the Greeks burned one hundred and sixty Bulgarian villages and destroyed at least 16,000 Bulgarian homes.”

There remains the murder of the Vicar of the Bulgarian Archbishop of Salonica, the Archimandrite Eulogius, a highly educated man : “An enlightened and ardent patriot of noble and elevated views.”

On June 17th the Greek Army bombarded the house in Salonica where the small Bulgarian force was stationed ; on the 18th the Bulgarians surrendered. On the 18th the Greeks arrested Eulogius and put him on

board a Greek steamer, "Mariette Ralli," towards evening he was transferred on board the "Catherine," where he was treated with gross contumely and cruelty. On the 19th the "Catherine" put to sea, three hours later Eulogius was stabbed and thrown into the sea. The Greek official account is that he was killed fighting in the streets of Salonica, regarding which account the Commission remarks, "Unfortunately it is not true."

The excesses of the Greek Army began on July 4th with the first conflict at Kukush. The excesses at Demir-Hissar occurred on July 7th. On July 12th King Constantine issued his order for reprisals based on the events at Demir-Hissar, and as the Commission says, "A comparison of dates will show that the Greek 'reprisals' had begun some days before the Bulgarian provocation." When the Greek Army entered Kukush it was still intact. It is to-day a heap of ruins. Well may the Commission say:

"The main fact on which we must insist is that the Greek Army inaugurated the second war by the deliberate burning of a Bulgarian town"—Kukush.

Verily, if the Greeks had remembered the Divine words, "Let him who is without sin amongst you cast the first stone," they would have hesitated before embarking on their campaign of mendacity which has so terribly and so completely recoiled on themselves.

FOURTH LETTER.

THE BULGARIAN PEOPLE AS SOLDIERS AND CITIZENS.—
THE PARLIAMENT.—SCHOOLS.—THE TOLERATION
OF ALL RELIGIONS.—TESTIMONY OF
CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES.

In my first letter I described the Bulgarians as the bravest, most liberty loving, most progressive, most tolerant race in the Balkans. To prove their bravery it is only necessary to refer to the conspicuous courage shown by the Bulgarian volunteers in the war of liberation in 1877. Six battalions of Bulgarian volunteers held in check 40,000 Turkish veterans under Suleiman Pasha at Stara-Zagora from morn till night, the carnage on both sides was great; the Bulgarians retreated to the Shipka Pass, and there they held the same Turkish Army in check for five whole days, where, without water and with their ammunition exhausted, they were relieved in their last extremity by a Russian force. No finer deed was done during the whole war of liberation. Then in 1913 we have the splendid victories of the Bulgarian Army over the main Turkish Army in Thrace, at Lozengrad, Sule, Bourgas, Boulair, Adrianopole, Chataldja—victories won at enormous cost in accordance with her treaty of alliance with Serbia, whilst her ally, Serbia, was already engaged in dishonestly breaking that treaty in Macedonia. To demonstrate her love of liberty one has to consider her action ever since she obtained her freedom in 1877. She established then her system of peasant proprietorship, which has won for her the title of Peasant State and which has undoubtedly produced a feeling of absolute equality which has no equal in

Europe. Her Constitution had to be finally sanctioned by the National Assembly to be held at Tirnovo, the ancient historic capital of Bulgaria. The Constitution placed before that Assembly, which consisted largely of young and wholly of untried politicians, emanating as it did from Bureaucratic sources, contained all the many devices called safeguards, which are so dear to anti-democratic minds. All these devices were swept aside, and the Constitution was formed on the broad foundation of universal suffrage of all males of 21 years of age inhabiting Bulgaria, without any restrictions whatever regarding racial origin, religion, property, or poverty. A broader basis can scarcely be conceived. On that basis it still rests. Outside influence induced Prince Alexander of Battenberg to suspend the Constitution in 1881, just as outside influence compelled him to abdicate in 1886, three years after he had restored fully the Constitution.

This Constitution was immediately extended to Eastern Roumelia, when she joined Bulgaria in 1885, and has also been extended to the small new territory left to Bulgaria by the ill-starred Treaty of Bucharest.

The present Sobranie (House of Assembly) consists of 244 Deputies, of which 41 are from the new territory left to Bulgaria by the Treaty of Bucharest. The number of Turkish deputies is 14, of which 11 come from the new territory. No other country in the Balkans has established such a democratic constitution. No other country has extended her constitution to newly acquired territories. As regards progress it must be remembered that 37 years ago Bulgaria was a Turkish Province. Sophia, the capital of Bulgaria, a mere Turkish village in 1878, with a population of about 20,000, is now a fine modern city with electric trams, electric light, good water and modern drainage, with many beautiful public buildings, including a large mineral bath establishment

supplied by a hot mineral spring unequalled in any capital in Europe. The population is now over 120,000. The total population of Bulgaria as constituted by the Treaty of Berlin was in 1880 2,007,919, the population of Eastern Roumelia in 1884 942,680, in 1887 the population of United Bulgaria was 3,154,375. In the period from 1887 to 1910 the population increased by 601,296 males and 581,842 females—total, 1,183,138. In 1912 the population was 2,253,699 males, 2,178,778 females—total, 4,432,427. In 1878 there were only 528 kilometres of railway lines, in 1888 there were 637 kilometres, and in 1914 there were 1,949 kilometres.

In 1879 her importations amounted in value to 32,137,800 francs, her exportations to 20,092,854 francs; in 1886, after her union with Eastern Roumelia, her importations were 64,285,309 francs and her exports 50,404,314 francs; in 1911 her importations had risen to 199,344,808 francs and her exports to 184,633,945 francs.

If the Treaty of Berlin had not deprived her of Kavala, a port on the Egean Sea, her trade with the west of Europe would have become much more important, as it is she takes the bulk of her imports from Austria and Germany. This may partly explain the action of the German Emperor last year when he fought "like a lion" to prevent Bulgaria obtaining the Egean port of Kavala. In 1879 there were 1,088 schools in Bulgaria with 1,379 teachers and 56,855 pupils. In 1881 there were in Eastern Roumelia 846 schools with 1,084 teachers and 48,094 pupils, giving a total of 144,949 pupils, of which only 19,144 were girls. A curious but not unnatural result of five centuries of Turkish rule. In 1886, after the union of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, there were 2,410 schools and 160,000 pupils. For the year 1911, the year before the war, there were 5,400 educational establishments, including national schools, intermediate schools, and high schools and private

schools. There were 13,461 teachers and 520,818 pupils, 309,582 were boys and 211,236 were girls.

These educational establishments were carried on at an expense of 25,372,472 francs, of which the State contributed 71.93 per cent. and the Communes 20 per cent. Of this sum 524,172 francs went to Mohamedan schools, 209,754 francs to Jewish schools, and 567,710 francs to Catholic schools, *i.e.*, to schools belonging to special religious bodies, including those under foreign management. The effect of this educational work is strikingly shown in the education of recruits. Military service is compulsory amongst all classes. In 1898 48.7 per cent. of the recruits were illiterate; in 1909, 20.6 per cent. were illiterate.

All are entitled to free education in all primary schools. In the higher schools those who are able to pay are charged small fees. Class distinctions in the schools are unknown. Rich and poor are educated together. I have also said that the Bulgarian race is the most tolerant in the Balkans. Bulgaria has accorded to all her subjects equal political and religious rights. The 602,000 Moslems under her rule for 35 years have never been persecuted. They are organised in religious communities administered by muftis, who are chosen by the communities and receive salaries from the Government. The Mohamedan schools are also subsidized by the Government, their management being left entirely to the committees chosen by Mohamedans. The Jews are religiously represented by the Grand Rabbi, who is elected by the Jewish population and receives a salary from the Government; through him the Jews are organised into special communities in the various towns. The Jewish population of late years has been increased by refugees from Russian persecutions. In 1887 there were 24,352 Jews, in 1910, 40,139. There are two American Protestant Missions carrying on their work with perfect

freedom. Bulgaria has more than once during the past few years been accused of oppressing the Catholics. I have frequently pointed out that Catholics in Bulgaria enjoy perfect freedom and equality. The two letters which I now give will, I trust, finally answer these untruthful accusations.

PHILIPPOPOLIS,

.15th November, 1914.

SIR,

In reply to your letter of the 12th I herewith give my opinion regarding the liberties accorded to Catholics in Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian Constitution, actually in force, was adopted at Tirnovo in 1879. Although it was elaborated at the moment, when Bulgaria was entirely in the power of Russia, it is one of the most liberal in Europe.

In virtue of chapter ix. (articles 37 and following) the Orthodox Christian religion is the religion of the State. Nevertheless, according to articles 40, 41, and 42, all other religions professed by aliens or subjects of the State, are entirely free on the sole condition that they shall not conflict with the laws of the State. Their religious affairs are managed by their respective ecclesiastical heads, without interference, but under the control of the State. If in a country where national feeling is very acute foreigners have a difficulty in establishing themselves, that is due to their being foreigners. As regards religion, however, Bulgaria exhibits a rare tolerance; so that the Orthodox clergy, the ministers of the different religions of the country—Catholics, Armenians, Jews, Mohamedans—all receive a fixed subvention from the State. Amidst religions and races so various has the Orthodox State of Bulgaria given to the Catholic Church a position of inferiority? No. The Catholics possess the benefits of the same tolerant con-

stitution, and enjoy the same rights as all Bulgarian subjects. Above all the adherents of other faiths, they have the inappreciable advantage, not only of being Bulgarian subjects of a different race united under the national flag, as the Armenians, the Greeks, the Jews, the Turks, but of belonging to the Bulgarian race and of passing in the eyes of all for Bulgarians. In addition the Catholic Church, represented by the Latins, comprises also Bulgarian Uniats, whose liturgy, ceremonies, prayers and language is Slav and differs in no particular from the liturgy of the Orthodox Bulgarians.

The Catholic Church in Bulgaria consists of 30,000 faithful; the two Dioceses of Sofia—Philipopolis and Nicopolis, maintain flourishing works which develop without hindrance, parishes and works of education and charity.

I beg you to accept, Sir, my respectful regards,

✠ ROBERT MENINI,

Archevêque Vic. Apost.

A Monsieur O'Mahony,
23, Rue Gladstone,
Sophia.

ÉCOLE CATHOLIQUE,

SOFIA,

November 11th, 1914.

The undersigned, Director of the French Catholic School in Sofia, declares that we have always, since the commencement of our work in 1881, enjoyed the great kindness of the public authorities. They have notably

allowed us full liberty of organisation according to our methods and programme. The inspectors on their visits to our school have always shown the greatest sympathy with and approval of our procedure. The French schools (boys and girls) at this date in Sofia consist of 950 pupils, of which the great majority are Bulgarian subjects. Bulgaria is undoubtedly the country in the Balkans where foreign schools, especially our own, enjoy the fullest liberty. This testimony I render with pleasure to a nation so hospitable as is Bulgaria.

To the truth of which I subscribe my name.

FRERE FLORIN,
Director.

A Monsieur O'Mahony,
Sophia.

In 1887 there were in Bulgaria 18,505 Catholics, in 1910, 32,132.

The Armenians, who belong to the Gregorian Church, also enjoy perfect religious and political freedom. In 1892 there were 6,643 Armenians, in 1910, 12,270.

During the Turkish war of 1912-13 the Turkish population of Bulgaria was subjected to no ill treatment. Though liable to military service, they were not asked to fight against their own race, and in many instances farms were cultivated for absent Bulgarians by their Turkish neighbours. During the war of liberation in 1877-78 a massacre of Christians by Turks took place in the town of Stara-Zasopa. Thousands were shot down in a church in which they had taken refuge. The church was burnt. Its ruins still remain. Yet in the streets of that town I have seen Turkish and Bulgarian children playing together. I have visited Turkish mosques and

Turkish schools, and I could find no trace of ill-feeling between the Christians and the Turks.

The most terrible massacre of Christians that took place at that period was the massacre of Batak, where 5,000 were slaughtered in cold blood ; that massacre was organised and carried out by a Turk named Hadji Alish. Hadji Alish was still alive and residing in the town of Tatar Pazardjik, within a few hours journey of the scene of the massacre, up to 1912, when he emigrated with his family to Turkey before the war. Verily the Bulgarians are by nature a most tolerant people. They are the only Balkan nation that can be said to govern justly a Mohamedan population. They are the only Balkan people who appear to understand even the rudiments of equality. From a disorganised, turbulent, ill-governed Turkish province, they have made a progressive, orderly and well-governed, peaceful realm, where a stranger may travel through valleys and mountain passes by day or night with as much safety as he can travel from one end of Great Britain to the other.

This is the Nation that was betrayed, deserted in 1913, and then despoiled at Bucharest by a treaty founded on the dishonourable breach of two solemn treaties which the nations that broke them had willingly entered into and which they broke with infinite dishonour in order to further their own selfish interests.

International confidence in the Balkans can only be restored by enforcing these two broken treaties. Mr. Lloyd George, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, has described treaties as the bank-notes of International relations, and has stated that to allow them to be repudiated in the interest of the repudiator is to march straight on the road to barbarism. Judged by this standard the Treaty of Bucharest was not only a long march on that evil road, but a direct incentive to others

to march along the same road, straight to barbarism. Is the expressed desire to stop this march a guiding principle with the allies of the Triple Entente? If so it must be applied to great powers and little nations equally, to allies, to neutrals, and to foes. They are now put to the proof in the Balkans, and by their action there they will ultimately be judged.

O'MAHONY.

Sofia, *December 7th*, 1914.

FIFTH LETTER.

THE TERMS OF SETTLEMENT.—THE BULGARIAN
DEMAND.—THE ANNEX TO THE TREATY
OF 1912.

January 2nd, 1915.

Abdul Hamid availed himself to the full of the racial animosities of the various Christian races in European Turkey. He never persecuted them simultaneously, when he persecuted the Greeks or Servians he favoured the Bulgarians, and *vice versa*. For many years previous to his abdication his persecutions were directed entirely against Bulgarians, whom alone he feared. The young Turks persecuted all the Christian races and drove them together. For a time it seemed as if the Greeks and Bulgarians in Southern Macedonia would learn to work together in spite of the opposition of the Greek Bishops. The final result was the alliance between Servia and Bulgaria, which Greece subsequently joined. Meantime the two States, which Mr. Balfour had described as the two "most interested," were doing their utmost to secure their own special interests. Suddenly war broke out and the allied Christian States marched against their old oppressor. The suddenness and completeness of their victories staggered the so-called Concert of Europe. The two Powers "most interested" looked on with ill-concealed anxiety. A wave of sympathy swept over Western Europe. Like a torrent it spread over Great Britain, and it may be confidently asserted that at no previous period had British sympathy been so strong and so universal in favour of the Christian

population of the Balkans. Even the *Times* of November, 1912, adopted Gladstone's formula—"The Balkans for the people of the Balkans." Hitherto it has never been part of the Russian policy that the Balkan nations should be able to stand on their own feet free from her protection. Undoubtedly her statesmen looked askance at the Bulgarian victories in Thrace. And Austria looked equally askance at the vanishing prospect of the realisation of her dreams in the west of the Balkans. Before the war began Serbia was secretly instructing her representatives abroad to press her claims far beyond the frontier beyond which she had pledged her honour to make no territorial claim. In the early months of the war Serbia was showing a clear intention to break the treaty made with Bulgaria, certainly encouraged, if not instigated, in this course by the late M. Hartwegg, the Russian Minister at Belgrade. I have recently come across an allusion to M. Hartwegg which at the present time is intensely interesting. It occurs in a telegram sent by Sir M. de Bunsen, the British Ambassador at Vienna, to Sir Edward Grey, the British Minister for Foreign Affairs, on July 31st, 1914. The passage is as follows:

"The Russian Ambassador has explained that Russia has no desire to interfere unduly with Serbia; that, as compared with the late Russian Minister, the present Minister at Belgrade is a man of very moderate views."

Whilst the late Russian Minister was encouraging Serbia not to keep faith with Bulgaria, Austria was advising Roumania to demand the cession of Bulgarian soil as a compensation for her neutrality, and the German Emperor was urging on the Turks to further resistance.

If honour is to prevail in the Balkans the Treaty of Bucharest must go. It was a dishonourable breach of two solemn treaties. The dishonour of breaking the

Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty rests primarily on Serbia, but it also rests on the late Russian Minister at Belgrade, who encouraged her, and on the Great Power he represented, who knew of the treaty and approved of it. The dishonour of breaking the treaty between Roumania and Bulgaria rests primarily on Roumania. Her action is the most despicable breach of honour that has ever taken place between nations calling themselves civilised, but this treaty was known to all the Ambassadors of the Great Powers at St. Petersburg, so they also are involved in this dishonourable breach.

The case against Roumania is so clear that it seems almost unnecessary to argue it. The Dobrudja was divided by the Treaty of San Stefano, and territory rightly Bulgarian was given to Roumania, as compensation for Bessarabia, taken from her by Russia. The Treaty of Berlin, when everything possible was done to weaken Bulgaria, took from Bulgaria still more of the Dobrudja and gave it to Roumania. The Treaty of Bucharest gave to Roumania the remaining portion of the Dobrudja, left to Bulgaria by the Treaty of Berlin and which had been hers for thirty-five years, and did that without a shred of justification. In addition Roumania from the time of her occupation of the Bulgarian Dobrudja has by her oppressions, civil and religious, showed herself unworthy to hold it, even if she had honourably gained it. It is impossible to read the treaty between Serbia and Bulgaria made on the 29th of February, 1912, without a feeling of intense sadness. It was conceived in a noble spirit founded on the acknowledged community of interests. One cannot help considering what the present position of the Balkan Peninsula would have been, if only that treaty had been honourably kept. The Balkans would no longer have been the field of rival ambitions and intrigues. Four strong nations would have blocked the way. But, alas, Serbia, tempted and encouraged from without from the

day the treaty was signed, broke it. Once more each Balkan State watches its neighbours with suspicion and alarm, once more the Balkan Peninsula is the field of rival ambitions and intrigues of surrounding Powers.

The secret annex to the treaty deals with the manner in which all territorial acquisitions are to be dealt with, and deals with all the territory then held by Turkey in Europe. Clause 2 provides that pending settlement all conquered territory shall be held in condominium. It then provides the basis on which the settlement is to be made. This basis starts with the words:

“Serbia recognizes the right of Bulgaria to territory East of the Rhodopes and the river Strouma. Bulgaria recognizes the right of Servia to territory to the North and West of Shar Mountain (Shar planina).”

It then continues:

“As regards the territories lying between Shar Mountain, the Rhodopes, the Ægean Sea, and the Lake Ochrida, if the two States are convinced that their organisation in the form of a separate autonomous province is impossible according to the common interests of the Bulgarian and Serbian Nationalities, or from other causes of an interior or exterior character, they shall deal with these territories in the following manner.”

“Serbia binds herself not to put forward any claim in regard to the territories lying beyond the line marked on the annexed map.”

It then goes on to describe with minute details this line. Then it continues:

“Bulgaria binds herself to accept this frontier if His Majesty the Russian Emperor, in his quality as arbitrator, expresses himself in favour of this frontier.”

Anyone who has any knowledge of Bulgaria's aspirations regarding her racial and national rights, pursued with set purpose since the day when her national conscience awakened, even before her liberation in 1878, will recognise the sacrifice her statesmen made when they agreed to the above clause. Then it goes on :

“ It is expressly understood that the two contracting parties bind themselves to accept as a final frontier, that line, which the Lord Emperor shall find most in accordance with the rights and interests of the two countries, *within the above set forth delimitations.*”

The Carnegie Commission is of opinion that “ within the above set forth delimitations ” means between Shar-Planina and the line marked on the map beyond which Serbia bound herself to make no claim. Clearly the Commission is correct in its judgment. It would be contrary to common sense to ask an arbitrator to express his opinion regarding a matter about which there was no dispute. According to the treaty and its secret annex, there was no dispute except as regards the territory lying between Shar-Planina and the line of demarcation so carefully and minutely described in the secret annex, *i.e.*, the disputed zone. To every portion of that disputed zone both parties urged strong claims, and it was because those claims were so irreconcilable that for the sake of mutual support against Turkey they agreed to submit these claims to the final arbitration of the Tsar of Russia. Bulgaria paid the price demanded of her by the treaty and sacrificed 83,000 of her sons on the plains of Thrace in the war against Turkey. Serbia in that war paid a much smaller price, her losses amounted to 23,000 officers and men. Bulgaria was always ready to abide by the treaty her Tzar had signed, she was always ready to submit to the arbitration of the Tsar of Russia the disputed zone. Serbia demanded the revision of the whole treaty. It has been often urged that Serbia did

this because Austria denied her access to the Adriatic. This is contrary to facts. In November last Monsieur P. Marinkovitch, a Serbian Deputy, a former Minister, and now again a Minister of the recently formed Serbian Government, visited Sophia. In an interview with Monsieur Adam Neitchoff, a Bulgarian Deputy, Monsieur P. Marinkovitch said, "You are mistaken if you think we insisted to remain in Macedonia because we failed to obtain an outlet to the Adriatic. This has nothing in common with Macedonia." The Treaty is dated 29th February, 1912. We now know that the Serbian Government on September 15th, 1912, *i.e.*, before the war against Turkey had commenced, and therefore before there was any action on the part of Austria regarding access to the Adriatic, issued a secret circular to its representatives abroad instructing them to urge Serbia's claims to territory far beyond the line carefully described in the Secret Annex to the Treaty, beyond which Serbia had solemnly bound herself, with the knowledge and consent of Russia, to make no territorial claim. We also have the facts related by the Carnegie Commission showing that Serbia by her conduct in Macedonia, closing Bulgarian schools, seizing Bulgarian churches, driving out Bulgarian Priests and Bishops, had already broken the treaty, whilst her ally was still engaged in fighting the main Turkish Army in Thrace. That all this was done with the knowledge and approval of the late Russian Minister at Belgrade, Monsieur Hartwegg, is also clear. I have in a previous letter given his words to a subject of a foreign power before the second war commenced. "Serbia must be strong, Bulgaria must give way all along the line." Then again Monsieur Marinkovitch, in his conversation with Monsieur Nietchoff, said, "As to the arbitration of the Russian Emperor we had received in the first half of the month of May positive assurance from Monsieur Hartwegg that we would keep the country as far as the Vardar," *i.e.*, Monsieur Hartwegg assured Serbia that his Sovereign

would exceed his powers, and assign to Serbia territory far beyond the limits imposed on his arbitration by the treaty of which he had approved. Well might the Russian Ambassador in Vienna think it advisable to assure the British Ambassador, Sir M. de Bunsen, in July last, "that as compared with the late Russian Minister the present Russian Minister at Belgrade is a man of very moderate views."

Having regard to these indisputable facts, it is mere trifling to consider who struck the first blow in the second war. The important fact, the only fact worthy of consideration, is that Serbia in spirit and by act had already broken the treaty, whilst her ally was still fighting in the common interests on the plains of Thrace, and that Serbia did this with the knowledge and with the approval and with the support of the Russian Minister at Belgrade.

It has been said that the treaty is full of the assumption that each party was to retain the territory it conquered. I have heard this stated in responsible quarters. I am a Barrister, I have had some experience in the interpretation of legal agreements. I have read the treaty line by line in Bulgarian, I have had it carefully translated into English. I cannot find one single word to justify such an assumption. The treaty is one of the most definite, one of the clearest documents I have ever read. The admission of Bulgaria's rights by Serbia is clear and unmistakable. The admission of Serbia's rights by Bulgaria is equally clear. Only as regards the territory lying between Shar-Planina and the well defined line indicated on the map annexed to the treaty, and minutely described in the secret annex, which was part of the treaty, are these mutual claims not finally and definitely dealt with. As regards this territory, the disputed zone, the rival claims are left to the arbitration of the Tsar of Russia. This territory alone is left to

arbitration, and both parties bind themselves to accept that arbitration. Serbia's claim to Macedonia is based on the extent of some Serbian Ruler's Empire centuries ago. It would be as reasonable for Great Britain to demand the cession of Calais from France at the conclusion of this war. It is more absurd than the Greek claim to Constantinople, or the revival of the so-called Greek Empire. As regards the territory so unjustly divided by the Treaty of Bucharest, Bulgaria, who sacrificed most, and received least, has alone shown herself worthy to receive new territory. She alone has extended to her new subjects the rights of citizenship, she alone has brought them within her own free constitution, she alone has granted to her new subjects full political rights and religious liberty. Roumania, Serbia, Greece have one and all denied to their new subjects political and religious freedom. One and all have established an exceptional regime and have treated their new provinces as conquered territory. Can the Powers of the Triple Entente view with equanimity the prospect of handing over Austrian territory to Roumania with her crippled constitution, her restricted franchise, her poverty-stricken peasantry seething with agrarian discontent, owing to her antiquated system of land tenure, her extremes of wealth and poverty? Can they without misgiving hand over to Serbia Austrian territory in spite of Serajevo, in spite of her crimes in Macedonia? Are all her sins to be blotted out because by accident she is fighting against Austria? The Powers of the Triple Entente are fighting to save Serbia from extinction, aye, and to save her from just punishment, does this deprive them of the right, does it not rather give them an undoubted right, to demand, that Serbia should act honestly? Can a durable peace be founded on three broken treaties? One secret but approved by Russia, the other two approved by all the great Powers. Can "the enthronement of public right as a governing idea of European policy," as described by Mr. Asquith in his speech in Dublin, be

forced to harmonise with the enslavement of a large portion of the most virile race in the Balkan Peninsula, a race that has given abundant proof of what Mr. Asquith terms "Corporate consciousness"? Mr. Asquith's Dublin speech gives more hope for the future of Europe, and points to a higher ideal than any utterance during the present war. Forty-four years ago this doctrine of public right was initiated by that great man, Gladstone. The breaking of treaties in the interest of the breaker, described by Mr. Lloyd George as a march straight along the road to barbarism, is the very antithesis of the doctrine of public right. If public right is to be enthroned in the Balkans, it is not sufficient to call a halt on the march to barbarism sanctioned at Bucharest. The retreat must also be sounded, and a fresh march commenced towards the nobler, juster, honourable goal of public right. Thus, and thus alone, can peace, security, justice, and good will be established in the East of Europe, and public right placed firmly on its throne.

O'MAHONY.

St. Patrick's Orphanage,
23, Rue Gladstone,
Sophia.

APPENDIX.

THE SERBO-BULGARIAN TREATY OF 29TH FEBRUARY, 1912.

His Majesty Ferdinand I., Tzar of the Bulgarians, and His Majesty Peter I., King of Serbia, profoundly convinced of the community of the interests and the identity of destiny of their States and their brotherly races, the Serbian and Bulgarian, who have decided, conjointly and with common forces to defend these interests, and to strive to bring them to a successful issue, agree as follows.

1. The Bulgarian Kingdom and the Serbian Kingdom mutually guarantee to one another the political independence and integrity of their territories by engaging themselves without any reservation whatever to mutually help each other with the whole of their forces, in every case where the one or the two States are attacked by one or several States.

2. The two contracting parties are likewise bound to help each other with all their forces in case any of the Great Powers should seek to annex or occupy, or conquer by military force, even though temporarily, any part whatever of the Balkan Peninsula which is at present under Turkish rule, if one of the contracting parties declares this fact to be against her vital interests and to constitute a "Casus belli."

3. The two contracting parties are bound not to conclude peace otherwise than jointly and by prearrangement.

4. With the object of securing the fulfilment of the present treaty in the fullest manner and corresponding fully with the purpose aimed at there will be concluded a Military Convention. It will fix both what must be undertaken by one or the other side in case of war and

also all in connection with the organization, movement, and mobilization of troops in time of war, all matters concerning the supreme command and whatever it may be necessary to arrange beforehand in time of peace for the conduct and good management of the war. The Military Convention shall constitute an inseparable part of the present treaty. Its elaboration shall be commenced not later than 15 days from the signing of the present treaty, and shall be completed in the course of the following two months.

5. The present treaty and the Military Convention are to remain in force from the day of signature until the 31st December, 1920, inclusive. They shall not be in force after this period except by means of a supplementary agreement formally ratified by the two contracting parties. If, however, on the day when the treaty and the Military Convention expire, both parties find themselves in a state of war or have not as yet succeeded in liquidating the consequences of the war, then the Treaty and the Convention shall remain in force until the signature of peace, or till the liquidation of the consequences of the war.

6. The present treaty is drafted in two identical copies, both of them in the Serbian and Bulgarian languages. It is signed by the Sovereigns and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the two States. The Military Convention likewise in two copies, written in Serbian and Bulgarian, shall be signed by the Sovereigns, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and by specially authorised military persons.

7. The present treaty and the Military Convention shall not be published, or communicated to other States except by the previous consent of the two contracting parties, jointly and simultaneously given, in the same manner the previously given consent shall be necessary for the association of a third State in the Alliance.

Drawn up at Sophia, 29th February, 1912.

Echelle de 1 : 1.500.000



SECRET ANNEX TO THE TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP AND
ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE BULGARIAN KINGDOM
AND THE SERBIAN KINGDOM.

1. In case that internal trouble should arise in Turkey of such a character as to endanger the national and State interests of the contracting parties, or of one of them, and also in case that internal or external difficulties, which Turkey may encounter, make it necessary to maintain the Status quo in the Balkan Peninsula, whichever of the contracting parties shall first come to the conclusion that military operations ought to be commenced, shall address a proposal to the other party giving her reasons, whereupon an exchange of views shall immediately take place, and if the other party shall not agree with the views of her Ally, she shall give her reasons for non-agreement. In the event of an agreement for united action being attained this agreement shall be communicated to Russia and in the event of this State not being opposed, action shall be commenced in conformity with the established agreement, in the spirit of solidarity and community of interests. Or, on the other hand, if an agreement shall not be attained the two States shall appeal to Russia for her opinion, and this opinion as stated by Russia shall be binding on both parties. If Russia refrains from giving an opinion, and if an understanding between the two contracting parties, even after this shall not be arrived at, and if in spite of all this the one of the two parties which is in favour of taking action shall decide to undertake it alone, on her own responsibility and at her own risk, then the other party shall be bound to maintain a friendly neutrality towards her Ally, by having recourse immediately to a mobilization within the limits set out in the Military Convention, and shall go with all her forces to the help of her Ally, if a third State shall take the side of Turkey.

2. All the territorial acquisitions won by joint action in the meaning of the articles 1 and 2 of the Treaty and article 1 of the present secret annex, shall become common property (Condominium) of the two allied parties. The final settlement of these territories shall be made without delay within a period of not more than three months after the conclusion of peace upon the following basis :

Serbia recognises the right of Bulgaria to territory east of the Rhodopes and river Strouma.

Bulgaria recognises the right of Serbia to territory to the north and to the west of Shar Mountain (Shar Planina).

As regards the territories lying between Shar Mountain, the Rhodopes, the Egean Sea, and the lake of Ochrida if the two States are convinced that their organisation in the form of a separate autonomous province is impossible according to the common interests of the Bulgarian and Serbian nationalities, or from other causes of an interior or exterior character, they shall deal with these territories in the following manner :

Serbia binds herself not to put forward any claim in regard to the territories lying beyond the line marked on the annexed map and which runs starting from the commencement of the Turkish-Bulgarian frontier at Mount Golem (*i.e.*, from Kriva Palanka) in the general direction towards the South-West up to the lake of Ochrida through Mount Kitka, between the villages Mejeevo and Podarji—Kon, through the highland turning East from the village Nerav, following the watershed to the height of 1,000 (metres), northwards from the village Bashtevo, between the villages Loubenitza and Petarnitza, through Mount Ostrich 1,000 (Licetz-Planina) to the height 1,500 between the

villages Drach and Opula, through the villages Talishmantzi and Jivalevo to the height of 1,050 and the height of 1,000, the village of Kojani by the chief watershed of the Gradishte Planina up to Mount Gorishte, to the height of 1,023, following on the watershed between the villages Ivankovtzi and Logentzi, through Vetersko and Sopot on the Vardar. Crossing the Vardar the line shall run along the ridge of the height 2,550 and on to the Mountain Petropole, along the watershed of this mountain to the villages Krapa and Barbares, to the height 1,200 between the villages Yakrenovo and Drenovo to the Mountain Chesma (1,254), along the watershed of the Mountains Baba-Planina, Krushka-telesi, between the villages Salp and Tzarsko to the height Protoiska Planina, to the east of the village Belitza, through Brejani to the height 1,200 (Ilinska Planina) by the watershed at the height 1,330 to the height 1,217 and between the villages Lovonshta and Gorentzi to the lake Orchrida at the Monastery of Gabovtzi.

Bulgaria binds herself to accept this frontier if His Majesty the Russian Emperor, in his quality as supreme arbitrator, expresses himself in favour of this frontier. It is expressly understood that the two contracting parties bind themselves to accept as a final frontier, that line which the Lord Emperor shall find most in accordance with the rights and interests of the two countries, within the above set forth delimitations.

3. A copy of the Treaty and the present secret annex shall be together communicated to the Imperial Russian Government with a request to take them into consideration, to show itself favourable to the objects which they have in view, and to intercede with His Majesty the Emperor for the acceptance and approval of those

functions which are marked out for Him and His Government in the articles of these two acts.

4. Every difference which may arise in relation to the interpretation, or the carrying into effect of any article of the Treaty, the present Secret Annex, and the Military Convention shall be referred to the final decision of Russia from the moment when one of the parties declares that it considers it to be impossible to come to an agreement by means of direct negotiations.

5. No term of the present secret annex may be made public, or communicated to another State, without the previous consent of both parties, and the consent of Russia.

Drawn up at Sofia, 29th February, 1912.

Bulgaria and the Powers.

A SIXTH LETTER

*In continuation of the Series already published
on the Balkans and written from Sofia.*

BY

THE O'MAHONY.

1915.

DUBLIN :

SEALY, BRYERS AND WALKER,
ABBAY STREET.

A SIXTH LETTER ON THE BALKANS.

ST. PATRICK'S ORPHANAGE,

23 RUE GLADSTONE,

SOFIA,

25th February, 1915.

Speaking in Dublin, the Capital of Ireland, on September 25th, 1914, the British Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, alluded to a statement which his former leader, Mr. Gladstone, made in 1870. Mr. Gladstone then said: "The greatest triumph of our time would be the enthronement of the idea of public right as a governing factor of European policy."

Mr. Asquith said that ought to be our main policy in the present war. Then he asked, what does the idea of public right mean? He said: "It means first and foremost a clear, but definite repudiation of militarism as a governing factor in the relations of states, and in the future moulding of the European world. It means that room must be found and kept for the independent existence and free development of smaller nationalities, each with a life, a history, and a corporate consciousness of its own. Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian Countries, Greece and the Balkan States, must be recognised as having as good a title as their more powerful neighbours, more powerful in strength and wealth, exactly as good a title to a place in the sun."

That means the substitution of Reason for Military Power, the substitution of Justice for Force. Mr. Asquith mentioned, in the portion of his speech quoted above, twelve small nations, if we include Roumania as a Balkan State. Of these twelve, only three were engaged in the present war, when Mr. Asquith spoke. The remaining nine were neutral, and are still neutral. Those,

therefore, who say that the benefits foreshadowed for small nations in Mr. Asquith's great speech are only for those who fight on the side of Great Britain in this war, make a statement absolutely opposed to the policy so clearly expressed by the Prime Minister of Great Britain in the speech I have quoted, and seek to place once more Force on the throne where Justice alone should reign. Such statements can only throw doubt on Mr. Asquith's sincerity. I, who have known Mr. Asquith since he first entered public life, and who listened to his first speech in the British Parliament, have not the smallest doubt that he will endeavour to the full to carry out the policy, which he proclaimed in Dublin as the policy of Great Britain towards small nationalities. According to Mr. Asquith, small nationalities are to be judged worthy of consideration by history, life, and corporate consciousness. History, as intended to be understood in Mr. Asquith's speech, must mean history, as it affects the present desires and feelings of the populations in the various territories. If it meant only the history of conquering powers, it would give to Rome the undoubted right to rule the greater part of Europe and Western Asia. If the Crown Prince of Serbia says we are to go back to the time of Tzar Dushan to decide who is entitled to rule Macedonia, Dushan reigned in 1530, having commenced his reign by strangling his own father, who died cursing his unnatural son, why should we not go back to 1018, when the Bulgarian Tzar Samuel ruled not only Macedonia, but the whole of present Serbia? History, as it affects the present inhabitants of the Balkan States, may be confined to the centuries of Turkish Rule. The Turk came as a conqueror and oppressor, a conqueror and oppressor he remained during the centuries of his rule; he came, as he himself often said, in blood, and in blood he was driven out. The people oppressed by the Turk for centuries have the historical right to possess the land from which they have driven him. The right, however, to the various portions of the territory freed ought to have

been decided according to the wishes of the inhabitants thereof, and that is a question of life and corporate consciousness, and not of the ancient history of Tzars and Conquerors. During the last century the Bulgarian race has given vivid proof of its life and corporate consciousness by its struggle against the educational and spiritual bondage of its race to the Greek Bishops and Priests ; by its successful struggle for the freedom of the Bulgarian Church, which culminated in the establishment of the Exarch as head of the Bulgarian Church. In this struggle for religious and educational freedom, the Slav race in Macedonia has always fully shared, and has thereby given unmistakable proof of the Bulgarian character of its Corporate Consciousness. Five archbishops, 647 priests, 677 churches, testified to the Corporate Consciousness of the Bulgarians in religious matters in Turkish times, in what is now Servian Macedonia. In the same territory, 596 schools, 1,005 teachers, and 36,000 scholars testified to the Bulgarian Corporate Consciousness in educational matters. In what is now Greek Territory, 299 priests and 300 churches testified to the Bulgarian Corporate Consciousness in religious matters, and 340 schools, 589 teachers, and 19,000 scholars testified to the Bulgarian Corporate Consciousness in educational matters. If the inhabitants were really Serbs and Greeks, why did not Serbia and Greece minister to their spiritual and educational needs? If the people were satisfied with the Greek religious and educational yoke imposed on them by the Turks, why did they struggle long and urgently until they regained their spiritual and educational freedom by the establishment of the Exarchate? Why is it that since the Treaty of Berlin all the revolutionary movements in Macedonia against the Turkish yoke were conducted by the Bulgarian race, and even opposed by Greeks and Serbs? How is it that the massacre of 1903 was a massacre of Bulgarians by Turks, and not a massacre of Greeks or Serbs? Why was the Bulgarian Orphanage at Bitolia established in Turkish

times, which gave a refuge to the remnants from the massacre of 1903, closed by the Serbians, and the unfortunate orphans turned adrift? If what is now Greek Macedonia was really Greek, why did the Carnegie Commission report as follows:—"Systematically and in cold blood the Greeks burned one hundred and sixty Bulgarian villages and destroyed at least 16,000 Bulgarian homes"? If the war against Turkey was a war of deliverance, why have the Serbian and Greek deliverers seized all the Bulgarian Churches, driven out the bishops, and priests, closed the schools, and forbidden education to Bulgarians in their mother tongue? Why have the Greeks seized and closed the excellent Bulgarian Gymnasium in Salonica, that was a centre of civilization for Southern Macedonia in Turkish times? The rule of the self-styled deliverers is more oppressive than that of the Turks, and its chief object seems to be the suppression of the Life and Corporate Consciousness of the inhabitants of the conquered territory, that is of the very factor to which Mr. Asquith attaches so much importance. Will Great Britain sanction such a policy, so diametrically opposed to the policy she has pursued for many years, and of which she has learnt the value in a marked manner during the present war? Germany expected that, at the sound of the first gun, revolutionary movements would break out in Ireland, in India, in Egypt, and in South Africa. In South Africa alone was there any sign of revolt, and that has been put down by the very men who were in arms against Great Britain when the present century commenced. The world has never seen a greater triumph for the value of freedom, and the acknowledgment of national rights, than that represented by the unanimity of the British Empire in the present war.

Viscount Bryce, known in Bulgaria as James Bryce, the late British Ambassador to the United States of America, has recently written an essay on *Neutral Nations and the War*. The essay ends with these words: "The faith of

treaties is the only solid foundation on which a Temple of Peace can be built up."

Can a Temple of Peace be built in the Balkans on the broken faith of the treaty made between Serbia and Bulgaria in 1912, with the sanction and approval of Russia? That treaty was willingly entered into by both Serbia and Bulgaria with a definite purpose, and for the sake of mutual gains not otherwise obtainable. It necessitated territorial sacrifices in the body of the Treaty and sacrifices on the field of battle. On the field of battle, Bulgaria sacrificed 83,000 of her sons on the plains of Thrace in the war against Turkey. In the same war Serbia sacrificed 23,000. Serbia got all the advantages accorded to her by the Treaty, though she had paid for them a far smaller price than Bulgaria had done. Then, instead of loyally conceding to Bulgaria the advantages secured to her honourably by the faith of the Treaty for which she had paid such a heavy price, she disloyally broke faith even while Bulgaria was still fighting the common enemy in Thrace, fortified herself in territories she had plighted her honour not to claim, and entered into an unholy alliance with Greece and Roumania in order to carry out her dishonourable breach of faith.

That is the plain history of the broken Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty of 1912. To men there may come peace in this life or the next, but nations only live this mortal life. Lord Bryce's Temple of Peace must be a Temple of Peace affecting living men, enshrining a living Peace, a Peace founded on justice, and the acknowledgment of National and religious rights, which are and must ever remain the life of a people. No such Temple of a living Peace can ever be erected in the Balkans on the dishonoured foundation of the broken faith of Serbia, nor of the crime of Bucharest. Even a mighty Empire like Russia could only erect on such a foundation a Temple of Injustice to enshrine the Peace of Death.

O'MAHONY.

University of Pennsylvania Library
Circulation Department

Please return this book as soon as you have
finished with it. In order to avoid a fine it must
be returned by the latest date stamped below.

~~FEB 20 1984~~

W

M-719

N/1198/00685/1567X

